

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-8, 11-15, and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cho (US 6,307,530) in view of Suenaga (US 4,772,100).

Claims 9 and 10 stand rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cho in view of Suenaga, and further in view of Asada et al. (US 5,963,287).

Claims 1, 10 and 15 are objected to due to some informalities.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 5-7, and 15 to further define the invention. Claims 2, 16, 19, and 20 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-15 and 17-18 are pending for reconsideration.

Claims Objections

Claims 1, 10 and 15 are objected to due to some informalities. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that use of the term “removable” by claims 1, 10, and 15 is somehow objected to. However, the Office Action fails to provide any grounds with which to object to the claims. While the analysis provided by the Examiner is appreciated, Applicant respectfully asserts there is(are) no ground(s) presented by the analysis that would require any amendment to the term “removable.”

Furthermore, the Office Action indicates that “[a]ppropriate correction is **required**.” However, Applicant is at a loss, without any specific grounds with which to object to use of the term “removable, as how to make an “appropriate correction.” Accordingly, unless the Examiner can provide specific reasoning or logical argument to object to use of the term

“removable” in claims 1, 10, and 15, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office Action withdraw the objection.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully asserts that use of the term “removable” has existed in claims 1, 10, and 15 from the specification, as originally filed on June 28, 2001. Now, some *four years later*, use of the term “removable” is somehow objected to. Applicant respectfully asserts that making objections to claim language at this point in the prosecution of the application based upon language that has existed since the filing of the application is a clear impediment to advancing prosecution of the application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that more attention be paid before making any further unnecessary objections, rejections, or restriction requirements that would take away from Applicant’s patent term.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-8, 11-15, and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cho (US 6,307,530) in view of Suenaga (US 4,772,100), and claims 9 and 10 stand rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cho in view of Suenaga, and further in view of Asada et al. (US 5,963,287). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as being based upon references that neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features recites in amended independent claims 1 and 15, and hence dependent claims 3-14, 17, and 18.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a liquid crystal display module including, in part, a first frame and a control printed circuit board, “wherein the first frame has at least one first coupling segment and at least one second coupling segment to hold, respectively, a side and an opposite side of the control printed circuit board.” Similarly, independent claim 15 recites a liquid crystal display device including, in part, source and control printed circuit boards,

“wherein the control printed circuit board is removable from the source printed circuit board and includes a plurality of notches disposed on opposing sides of the control printed circuit board.”

In contrast to Applicant’s claimed invention and the Office Action, Applicant respectfully asserts that Cho fails to teach or suggest anything with regard to a first frame and a control printed circuit board, “wherein the first frame has at least one first coupling segment and at least one second coupling segment to hold, respectively, a side and an opposite side of the control printed circuit board” as required by amended independent claim 1. Similarly, Applicant respectfully asserts that Cho fails to teach or suggest anything with regard to a liquid crystal display device including, in part, source and control printed circuit boards, “wherein the control printed circuit board is removable from the source printed circuit board and includes a plurality of notches disposed on opposing sides of the control printed circuit board,” as required by amended independent claim 15. Although the Office Action alleges that “[t]he circuit boards have notches (Figures 1 and 3 for example),” Cho discloses *nothing* with regard to notches in either FIGs. 1 or 3 “disposed on opposing sides of the control printed circuit board,” as required by amended independent claim 15. Furthermore, although Cho may disclose the use of screws and bolts to attached corner portions of the interface board 10 and the main PCB 11, Applicant respectfully asserts that Cho discloses *nothing* with regard to a frame that holds opposing sides of either the interface board 10 or the main PCB 11.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Office Action does not rely upon Suenaga and/or Asada et al. to remedy the above-identified deficiencies of Cho. In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Office Action cannot rely upon Suenaga and/or Asada et al. to remedy the above-identified deficiencies of Cho since Suenaga and Asada et al. are both

completely silent with regard to a first frame and a control printed circuit board, “wherein the first frame has at least one first coupling segment and at least one second coupling segment to hold, respectively, a side and an opposite side of the control printed circuit board” as required by amended independent claim 1, or to a liquid crystal display device including, in part, source and control printed circuit boards, “wherein the control printed circuit board is removable from the source printed circuit board and includes a plurality of notches disposed on opposing sides of the control printed circuit board,” as required by amended independent claim 15.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because none of the applied prior art references, whether taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest the novel combination of features clearly recited by independent claims 1 and 15, and hence dependent claims 3-14, 17, and 18.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant’s undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____



David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: May 25, 2005

Customer Number: 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004
202-739-3000